

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>		Application No. 09/493,984	Applicant(s) EISENBART ET AL.	
		Examiner Michael J Simitoski	Art Unit 2134	
All Participants:		Status of Application: _____		
(1) <u>Michael J Simitoski</u> .		(3) _____.		
(2) <u>Thomas Franklin</u> .		(4) _____.		
Date of Interview: <u>25 November 2003</u>		Time: <u>10:00 a.m.</u>		
Type of Interview:				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)				
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				
If Yes, provide a brief description:				
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed:				
Prior art documents discussed:				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet				
Part III.				
<input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.				

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The purpose of this phone interview was to clarify that pre-amendment B (Oct. 31, 2003) had been submitted after a first office action (Oct. 28, 2003). Mr. Franklin was aware that pre-amendment B set forth identical claims as set forth by pre-amendment A. According to Mr. Franklin, the second pre-amendment was submitted to remove any confusion, if any confusion existed, as a result of pre-amendment A suggesting a previous amendment had been submitted, which it had not. As no changes have been made to the examined claims, with respect to the office action, Mr. Franklin will respond to the original office action..